

Roland Peer
Falls Church, VA 22043

New Hampshire Site Evaluation Committee
Pamela G. Monroe, Administrator
21 South Fruit Street, Suite 10
Concord, NH 03301

Re: Public Comment for Northern Pass Transmission – Eversource SEC Docket No. 2015-06ve

Dear Ms. Monroe:

I have been following the Northern Pass hearings and would like to point out a few observations. Northern Pass is backed by a group of very talented, well spoken, and experienced legal and regulatory experts who do this for a living. But there are a few undeniable facts – pylons which cannot be moved, no matter how convincing the argument may be:

- ***Northern Pass at face value hurts New Hampshire:*** if this were a good deal for New Hampshire, Hydro-Quebec and Eversource would not need to propose hundreds of millions in the Forward NH Fund to attempt to buy off the state. The project would stand on its own merits. But this is not the case.
- ***Energy benefits to New Hampshire are minimal:*** Eversource officials have been quoted as saying USD 80 million in wholesale and USD 80 million in retail benefits per year for New Hampshire. This is less than 10% of the total energy benefit of the project, most of which will serve the rest of New England. Eversource has already spent more than this annual amount trying to secure the project, including buying land. The economic benefits to New Hampshire are small change in the eyes of the powerful backers and financiers of Northern Pass.
- ***Energy benefits to New Hampshire are unevenly distributed:*** The Balsams Resort anticipates USD 200,000/year in savings – 0.25% of the entire benefit of the project. Meanwhile, many in Coos County who would actually be affected by the Towers would not benefit at all.

The only argument which could turn the equation in favor of Northern Pass would be if this were an inter-state approval process and the cost-benefit equation were applied to all of New England. This is not the case. To further demonstrate my point, however, let's suppose this were an inter-state approval process. Even then, the approval process would need to be based off of case-law where the interests of the few are sacrificed for the public good of the many, and as we saw in the Kelo Supreme Court case, there are significant moral and ethical questions to this, to the point that even the Supreme Court ruled that this should be a state issue.

Speaking of state issues, this brings us back to Northern Pass. This isn't a New England-wide issue, where you are considering the cost-benefit to the whole region. This is strictly a New Hampshire approval process, and the threshold question is whether Northern Pass is good for the state. As noted above, the total economic benefit to New Hampshire is small; pales in comparison to the overall project benefit; is unevenly distributed; and requires a hundreds of millions on the side as an investment fund to attempt to bring New Hampshire to the negotiating table.

Are you willing to sacrifice New Hampshire's unmatched natural landscape for a few hundred million dollars, which in a few decades will be lost in memory, leaving behind only the permanent disfiguration of Northern Pass towers?

Thank you for considering this,
Roland Peer
703-869-3677
Peer.roland@gmail.com